DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 566 EA 02? 987

AUTHOR Boyd, Bill; And Others
TITLE Impacts of Interagency Collaboration on Participating Organizations.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Human Services; Intergroup Relations; Organizational Change; *Program Effectiveness; *School Community Relationship; Shared Resources and Services
IDENTIFIERS *Colorado

ABSTRACT

Issues in interagency collaboration and the experiences of a collaborative effort in a rural, economically depressed county of Colorado are discussed in this paper. The first section reviews the concepts of cooperation and collaboration as they relate to interagency activities and offers a literature review. The second section presents the findings of three studies that investigated the impact of collaboration on organizations and individuals that participated in the Center Project, a Leadville, Colorado, collaborative effort that provided human services to address the problems of at-risk children and children from economically depressed families. Data for each ethnographic study were derived from document analysis and interviews with key agency members and participants. A primary outcome was improved support for families. However, perceptions of school personnel contrasted with those of agency representatives, which suggests that boundaries among organizations were not reduced. From the school-level view, the project may be one of "cooperation" among community agencies rather than one of "collaboration." The findings suggest that collaboratives may have a greater impact on the individuals involved than on the participating organizations. Recommendations are made to involve affected personnel at all stages of planning and implementation, help people adapt to change, and address resource concerns. (29 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346566

Impacts of Interagency Collaboration on Participating Organizations

presented at the Annual Meeting of the

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

by

Bill Boyd, Becky Duning, Ruth Gomez, Robert Hetzel,
Richard King, Susan Patrick, and Kathryn Whitaker

Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education, McKee Hall
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, CO 80639

303-351-2861

April 23, 1992

EA 023 987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. King

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Impacts of Interagency Collaboration on Participating Organizations

Introduction

The extent of poverty, health problems, and other social ills facing many families in the United States is not new to educators and policy makers. Hodgkinson (1991), stating that children appear to be an "endangered species" in this country, cites the following: since 1987, an alarming one-fourth of all preschool children have lived in poverty; single female heads of households have increased 35.6% between 1980 and 1990; and reports of child abuse or neglect made to child protective agencies have tripled since 1976. These statistics give only a glimpse of the social and economic problems facing families and the nation -- problems that must be alleviated if children are expected to learn in schools and to avoid dependency on social services as adults.

The growing chasm between society's difficult problems and how organizations can help is driving a call for reform. Schools alone cannot solve the social ills of society, just as human service agencies alone cannot resolve these complex problems (Liontos, 1990). One promising answer to these critical social issues is collaboration among agencies that serve children and families. Both demographics and financial considerations support collaboration. As Hodgkinson (1989) suggests, we simply must get more mileage out of the resources and organizations that are currently in existence.

Interagency collaboration provides a structure for bringing together a broad range of professional expertise on behalf of children and families. Once-fragmented service agencies work closely to coordinate existing services and reorganize available resources to create more effective prevention, treatment, and support (Melaville & Blank, 1991). This concept offers new roles and opportunities for school systems as they integrate educational programs with mental health, juvenile justice, family services, homeless shelters, drug rehabilitation, and other agencies. Some of the goals of interagency collaboration include improving student achievement, parent literacy, and health care while at the same time reducing dropout rates, teen pregnancy, criminal behavior, and drug and alcohol abuse.

A growing number of projects around the nation have reconceptualized purposes of organizations participating in interagency initiatives and have overcome barriers such as fragmented service systems and isolated professional staff (Gardner, 1990; Kirst and McLaughlin, 1990; Melaville & Blank, 1991). Studies document the positive effects of collaboration on the success of the child, especially in terms of student achievement (Rosenholtz, 1989; Handel, 1990). Because of the potential for improving student outcomes, and because of their continuing contact with children and youth, schools can play an important role in providing "integrated case management" and serving as "hubs" of social service delivery systems (Kirst and McLaughlin, 1990).

In this paper we review the concepts of cooperation and collaboration as they relate to interagency activities, and we present findings of a cluster of studies. This research project investigated impacts of collaboration on organizations and individuals participating in a Colorado collaborative. We suggest that collaboratives may have greater impact on *individuals* involved than on participating organizations, and we offer recommendations for groups interested in interagency activities.

Collaboration Demands More Than Cooperation

Institutions have coordinated efforts over the years in many different ways as they have formed partnerships, consortia, collaboratives, and so on. It is clear from the emerging literature that "collaboration" among organizations requires more than what has occurred traditionally when autonomous institutions "cooperate." In a cooperative effort, partners help each other reach their distinctive organizational goals. Strategies of cooperative relationships often include networking, information sharing, and assessments to determine community needs and to identify overlapping services (Melaville & Blank, 1991). However, cooperating agencies do not make substantial changes in the basic services they provide or in the rules and regulations governing their agencies. In a cooperative effort, financial and human resources are generally not shared between agencies and there may be duplication of effort and waste of resources (Hord, 1986).

Interagency collaboration is dramatically different. While interagency cooperation may be viewed as "tinkering around the edges" to provide a neater system (Kagen, 1990), interagency collaboration seeks to establish a vision and

shared goals about how to address problems of children and families. There is a transition from a competitive value system to a collaborative one (Appley & Winder, 1977) as participants agree to jointly plan, implement and evaluate new services to more effectively identify and meet families' needs:

> The advantage of collaboration over cooperation is the possibility it affords to restructure the expertise and resources of partner agencies and design and deliver services that are developmental rather than remedial in philosophy, preventative rather than merely corrective in approach, and centered on the total needs of the family and child. (Melaville & Blank, 1990, p. 18)

The National School Boards Association (1991) encourages collaboration to enable two or more parties with similar or overlapping objectives to reach goals they could not achieve acting alone. This kind of collaboration goes beyond communication and coordination: "Communication involves providing more complete information, but does not require any interaction among agencies. Coordination implies joint activity, but does not require participants to share a common goal." (p. 4, emphasis theirs) Hoyt (1991) conceptualizes collaboration as a sharing of responsibility, authority and accountability:

> To the extent that educators and individuals from the private sector are to share responsibility for helping pupils, they must also share authority. To the extent that they share authority, they must also share accountability. This three-way sharing is what I have called 'collaboration'. (p. 451)

Differences between cooperation and collaboration are discussed by Hord (1986) in terms of beginning processes, communications, resources and ownership, requirements, leadership and control, and rewards. Whereas a cooperative begins with an agreement for one organization to assist another, the initiation of a collaborative rests on organizations joining forces to outline shared goals and action plans. Communication in a cooperative is characterized as a conveyance of information from one organization to another, unlike the more fluid communication channels among people at different levels in collaboratives. An "us/them" process mode typifies the individual

proprietorship of cooperating institutions, whereas a "we" process of system ownership and mutual funding of activities typifies collaboratives. A cooperative requires one organization to obtain permission from another to analyze problem areas; a collaborative demands both groups to devote time and energy in taking action and risks and requires each to contribute expertise. Unilateral leadership and central control characterize organizations in a cooperative, whereas dispersed leadership, delegation of responsibility, and mutual control typify collaboratives. Finally, one organization reaps greater direct benefit from a cooperative activity, unlike the sharing of products or services and the expansion of possibilities that result from collaboration among organizations that do not have to "spread thin" to address problems. Hord (1986) notes that the public may gain greater benefits from joint efforts of public service agencies than each separate organization can offer independently. Collaboration eliminates duplicate services and improves the quality of services.

Rather than compete for societal support, it makes sense for a number of agencies to share resources and information about families and children. As individual agencies yield identities and control over resources, boundaries disappear or become more permeable, depending on the nature of the new organization created (Schopler, 1987). Interagency collaboration challenges organizations, including schools, to embrace a different paradigm as they part with traditional structures that represent fragmentation, bureaucracy, and duplication.

Kirst & McLaughlin (1990) propose that public schools, in order to survive and become more efficacious, become a "hub" or "nexus" of comprehensive student services. The National School Boards Association (1991) argues that schools are an "integral component in many successful collaboratives" since they are the most accessible, appropriate, and accountable institutions in children's lives (p. 3). Schools are politically and philosophically the right arena for collaboration. Children's learning benefits directly from adequate social services and suffers when they are not forthcoming. Schools have a vested interest in improving conditions that impact learning if they are to be held accountable for academic achievement and preparation for the work place. Guthrie and Guthrie (1991) discuss the challenge of reconceptualizing the role of the school and its relationships with community agencies: "The new arrangement must be designed so that it shifts the emphasis of each agency away from itself and toward the client: the child." (p. 17)

The Education and Human Resources Consortium (see NSBA, 1991) proposes five key elements in a successful collaborative: (1) a wide array of services to address the complexity of problems, including prevention, treatment, and support services; (2) techniques to ensure that children and families who need services actually receive appropriate support; (3) a focus on the entire family; (4) a commitment to empowering families, actively involving them in identifying services they need and determining approaches that will be most successful; and (5) changing evaluation measurements, shifting from measuring the number of clients and other inputs to measuring such outputs as skills attained and student placement in jobs.

The second of these five requirements has been realized through three primary models for linking agencies and bringing services closer to children and families (Guthrie & Guthrie, 1991; NSBA, 1991; Melaville & Blank, 1991). In one approach, social service agencies house one or more "branch offices" in other locations including schools. A second model calls for a single "case manager" or "professional coordinator" to work with a given family and assume the primary responsibility for identifying and coordinating services. In the final model, which is similar to the Center Project described below, a school or other single location selected for easy access and close coordination becomes a "broker" of collaborative supports and services. Heleen (1990) describes the role of a broker as "putting the pieces of the puzzle together by making crucial services more accessible to children and their families." (p. 19)

While collaboration encourages the value of interdependence, cooperation promotes the value of autonomy among society's institutions. Boundaries among agencies disappear when there is a sharing of authority with regard to decisions about appropriate services for children and a pooling of human and financial resources to meet their needs. Expectations placed on participating people and organizations are more demanding in a collaborative effort. If the promise of strengthening the capabilities of formerly independent organizations to improve conditions for children and families is realized, then the outcomes of collaboration will be worth the sacrifice of autonomy.

Studies of The Center Project

With this understanding of interagency collaboration from the literature, we designed several studies of impacts of an ongoing collaborative effort. We felt that by talking to people within and outside of a project, we could get a better sense of organizational independence and interdependence and impacts on cooperating institutions and their personnel. Several teams of researchers focused on these issues as they interviewed participants in person or by phone and examined related documents.

The collaborative chosen for the investigations was the Center Project, which is located in Leadville, Colorado. Lake County is characterized by the highest unemployment rate in the state following a large-scale layoff of mine workers, a sharply reduced assessed valuation of property during the 1980s, a high percentage of children from low socio-economic families, and the highest school dropout rate of any rural district in the state (McCabe, 1989). In facing this crippling economic situation, the Center Project was founded on the belief that coordinated efforts would best address the problems of children-at-risk and children from economically depressed families. Although it was established by the Board of Education as a self-funding enterprise of the school district, The Center has its own governing board of directors which consists of the superintendent, a parent, a school board member, a professional educator from outside the school system, a member chosen at large, and a member representing the interests of handicapped children.

The Center was in its third year of operation in 1991 when we conducted the studies described in this paper. The Center provides preschool, day care, before- and after-school, and summer programs; cooperates with other agencies to offer prenatal care, a young mothers program, teen pregnancy intervention; provides offices for child and family counseling; and works with an area college to improving skills of people working in such programs. The Project involves the following organizations: Lake County School System, Lake County Department of Health, Lake County Department of Social Services, Mountain Valley Development Center, and Colorado Mountain College. It works closely with several other entities, including Head Start, Lake County Library, Mountain Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), and the Colorado Department of Education.

The Center is a nationally recognized interagency activity. Selected by Yale University as one of their schools of the 21st Century, it serves as a "model in innovative programs." (Colorado Department of Education, 1990, p. 7) In recognition of its success, US West Inc. presented the Center Project its "Jack MacAllister Community Connection Award" in August 1991.

One study inquired about changes in organizations and individuals as a result of collaboration (Duning, Hetzel, & Patrick, 1991). These researchers interviewed 15 middle managers, supervisors and front line employees of nine of the participating agencies. They examined changing roles of participating agencies, motives that led to their involvement, and changes necessitated in organizations to make the Project work. This first study further examined the importance placed on organizational independence and interdependence before and after collaboration.

Two related studies looked at the impact of the Center on the school system from the perspective of school employees and parents. The first of these focused attention on the school district itself in terms of its mission, goals, roles and operations (Boyd, 1991). Interviews with twenty-two subjects, including teachers, principals, counselors, the Center Director and the Superintendent, inquired about whether the school system had undergone a transformation and whether it had become a nexus of comprehensive social services and education. Interviews with school district personnel explored the Project's current status and prospects for the future, changes in educational goals, and daily operations of the schools. Additional inquiries explored how the roles of school personnel changed, alterations in perceptions of the schools' purposes and the role of education in the lives of children as a result of the Project, and attitudes about schools becoming centers for social services.

The second of these two related studies directed attention to parents' perceptions of satisfaction with services of the Center and of changes in schools due to its operation (Gomez, 1991). Interviews with 13 parents of children currently receiving services, including one parent serving on the governing board, inquired about their children's gains as a result of participating in the Center as well as about resulting changes in the role of schools. Parents indicated whether their children received services, reasons for nonparticipation if their children were eligible, benefits gained by the family or individual children, changes in the perceptions of school roles as a result of the Project, and whether they felt the Project is permanent or experimental.

Each of these descriptive studies made use of ethnographic research methodologies (Goetz & Lecompte, 1984; Wolcott, 1988), depending primarily on semi-structured interviews with key participants in the agencies or parents associated with the Center. Researchers also examined documents related to the Project, including a description of its formation and first year of operation (McCabe, 1989). Although each study yielded additional findings about this collaborative activity, the focus of this paper is the Center's impact on individuals and participating organizations.

What Have We Learned About this Collaborative?

Discussions with key persons involved in the collaborative project indicated perceptions of improved social service delivery in the community. Impacts were talked about primarily in personal rather than organizational terms, and there were mixed reactions about the effects of the Project on schools.

Improved Support for Families

Agency personnel and parents of children receiving services identified a number of successes of the Center Project. It has clearly become an important community resource.

Agency managers and staff reported improved capabilities of participating institutions to serve clients. It was felt that the shared understanding of the functions and operations of other organizations that results from collaboration led to increases in referrals among participating agencies. Enhanced performance was defined in terms of a larger number of individuals served, new services made available, and increased efficiency of services delivered. Families and the larger community benefited from newly unified services and the enhanced support system. By enabling parents to return to work, there was a reported reduction in the number of people receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

Interviews with parents also indicated positive results. Parents cited gains in social interaction skills, oral language development, decision making ability, self-esteem, responsibility, good health habits, and readiness for educational advancement for their children. These parents agreed unanimously that

children from a cross-section of economic backgrounds benefited from the Center's services.

Beyond the gains made by children, parents reported a sense of freedom and security, peace of mind, and self-confidence. In large part these feelings resulted from the trust they had in the Center staff, who were described as caring about children, responding to parents' desires, communicating effectively, and creating an open, friendly environment. Several parents commented that peace of mind allowed them to work and pursue personal growth. Each parent stated that the Center was necessary and that its continuation had wide community support.

Stronger Effects on People than on Organizations

The first study described above was designed to sense any shifts in the relative value placed on organizational autonomy and interdependence (Duning, Hetzel, & Patrick, 1991). It became apparent that managers and staff of agencies involved in this collaborative interpreted change more in terms of personal effects and relationships among people than in terms of roles of participating organizations.

Agency personnel cited a sense of personal threat, tension, or loss of personal creativity as well as feelings of connectedness, congeniality, and mutual appreciation as a result of new interagency arrangements. Changes in working conditions were nearly always cast by staff in terms of their effect on the individual, similar to what Hall (1987) found in his research on change. Personnel in this study described changes as personally challenging or enabling, yielding feelings of increased self-confidence, respect, knowledge, and trust. Participants further reported greater insight into program development processes and heightened sensitivity to the importance of working in partnership with others. It was observed that people working together create a synergistic effect that is often stronger than the efforts of any one part of the group.

There were also reports of improved professional satisfaction. Not only was there a sense of improved social services for the community, but doing the job better was cited by many participants as a source of job satisfaction. Although there were changes in respective organizations to yield such improvements, once again their responses revealed that an organization as an entity may not change as dramatically as do the individuals within the organization.

From the findings of this study, it appears that many agency personnel felt impacts of the Center. Individually, they have changed orientations in line with the goals of interdependence. Findings of a second study of the Project, however, suggest that not all people and organizations have been this directly affected.

Mixed Views of the Center's Impact on Schools

The study of perceptions of school personnel revealed conflicting perceptions about impacts of the Center Project on schools (Boyd, 1991). Although some school district personnel have assumed critical roles in giving leadership to this collaborative, it has not involved all potential participants. Thus, it has not yet had as comprehensive an impact on schools as might be desired.

The Center Project, created largely at the behest of the school district superintendent, is housed in a former elementary school building. The Director, who was previously a special education teacher in the district, was hired by and remains subordinate to the superintendent. The Center's impact on the schools is not as clear as the impact which the school district has had in its creation and maintenance.

On the one hand, if it is accepted that the Center is a new entity within the school system, then there has been a large change in the role of schools in this community. There are educational programs 365 days a year, and services are available to children between 5:00 AM and 6:30 PM. There were comments in teachers' interviews that "school is now for families, not just children" and that "the schools are serving children from birth through grade twelve." This view of the changing role of schools in the community paralleled those of many parents (Gomez, 1991). Although some parents regarded the Center as a day care provider, others recognized the value of its educational programs. Several parents responded that the Center differed from other schools, because it was child-oriented, parents were visible, children felt ownership, and teachers listened and were involved with parents. Parents also expressed a sense of shared responsibility for their children's education.

On the other hand, the Center is not integrated with the school system. Services are not offered in any school, and district personnel are not involved in a systematic way. Many teachers rejected any notion of a role change within the school, in educational goals, or in day-to-day school operations. Interviews

revealed a lack of direct knowledge of Center programs, particularly among secondary school personnel. Elementary teachers, who would be expected to be in closer contact with the Center's programs in early childhood education, also did not have first-hand knowledge about the Center's programs. Perhaps the separation of physical facilities contributed to a lack of effective communication between schools and the Center (Whitaker & King, 1991). The lack of awareness about Center activities could indicate a lack of program integration or a lack of shared vision. Indeed, some perceived the Center as a "satellite program" of the Superintendent.

Reports about the Center's role in relation to the schools suggest fears of the Center assuming a larger role and consuming more resources. Typical statements included: "technically it is not part of the school system" and "people now accept the Project because they know it is not part of the school." One individual noted a suspicion that school funds were used to offset transportation and maintenance costs and commented: "If so, this would be wrong; it is to be self-funded without tax dollars." The need for additional resources to bring greater integration was addressed by school personnel. To inspire teachers to make a commitment to this new direction would require "more money and training." One teacher verbalized, "Something would have to give; either current teaching responsibilities would have to be reduced or additional teachers would have to be hired." These comments by school personnel suggest that there is not a shared vision about the role of the Center in relation to the schools.

Several school personnel revealed possible underlying reasons for the negative feelings. While the Center has grown, there has been a reduction in force within the school district in response to declining enrollments and resources. Furthermore, it was expressed that the media, scholars, and Superintendent had focused attention on the Center to the exclusion of other programs in the schools. Typical comments included: "we have funds for the Center, but nothing for the rest of the schools" and "the Superintendent spends more time at the Center than any place else." Often times the politics of collaboration such as conflicting interests and competition for scarce resources contributes to negative feelings (Hawley, 1988, Whitaker & King, 1991).

These observations about the isolation of the Center from the school system, however, do not detract from its successes. It appears to be highly successful in serving the community's needs and perhaps of enabling the school system to survive. Indeed, many school personnel cited positive effects on

students who had attended the Center's preschool program. The "alumni" of the Center were said to be more expressive due to increased verbal skills and to be better problem-solvers in comparison to students who had not had this experience. One administrator claimed that the High Scope curriculum, which emphasizes creativity, decision making and choice, permeated the rest of the school system. The whole-language program of the Center was reported to be integrated with the elementary schools' language curriculum. Some respondents described the schools to be more "developmentally oriented" and moving toward a "no failure" orientation due to the Project's influence.

Mixed findings from interviews with school personnel contrast with those derived from discussions with managers and employees of other participating agencies. From the school-level view, the Project may be one of "cooperation" among community agencies rather than one of "collaboration." Indeed, despite its successes, this project does not appear to measure up to the literature which suggests that true collaboration reduces boundaries among organizations through shared visions and goals, joint planning, pooled resources, and full involvement of personnel in service delivery to meet children's needs in the broadest sense.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Our conclusions about impacts evidenced in this collaborative effort suggest a number of recommendations for institutions approaching interagency collaboration. We suggest that greater consideration be given to involving affected personnel at all stages of planning and implementation, recognizing personal impacts of collaboration in staff development efforts, and addressing resource concerns to ease the burden of transformation.

Involving People Who Are Affected by Collaboration

Findings from the interviews with managers and agency personnel contribute to the literature on the initiation and maintenance of collaboratives, pointing out the value of interpersonal relations. Collaboration results from people and groups coming together from different backgrounds and disciplines to accomplish common goals. Individuals and groups may initially have agendas that are far apart, but the process of developing shared goals and

common vision provides a bridge to collaboration. This shared vision is possible if a framework has been established to promote trust and respect among participants.

Once created, the interagency effort demands that personal doubts and desires be put aside to accommodate untested working relationships. Accommodation to new ways of working requires risk-taking that is perceived by staff members to be personal not organizational. Team efforts, give and take, mutual respect, cooperative decision making, withholding judgement, and overcoming skepticism were seen as important to cooperative work.

The initiation of such a far reaching organizational change as that demanded by interagency collaboration requires that all agencies with a vested interest in defining the problem must be involved from the beginning. Effective change strategies (Hall, 1987) help subordinates feel that they have a role to play and are needed. Our study of this collaborative effort suggests that later "buy-in" of participants (i.e., the people within the organizations) rests upon their sharing a vision and an understanding of what is trying to be accomplished. The shared visions of people will find greater support if those visions reflect at least in part the value systems of the community. Collaboration has a better chance of success if participating people and organizations are able to claim elements of ownership in the collaborative effort.

If school systems and other agencies are to undergo a transformation in ways they operate and relate to one another, it is essential to involve school-level personnel in the change process. The isolation of schools from the Center Project, with its characterization as a "satellite program," contributes to negative feelings among school personnel. Teachers and counselors, who have day to day contact with children, should be encouraged to interact with families and multiple service agencies about children's developmental needs. Yet, our findings point out the reluctance of school personnel to become fully supportive of change efforts without a careful definition of expectations and resource use. Ascher (1990) echoes this conclusion, stating that school organization proves problematic for service professionals. Kirst and McLaughlin (1990) recognize these issues in calling for the creation of incentives for teachers, changes in training of principals, and new programs in staff development. They argue, "Collaboration needs to penetrate the classroom and help students achieve academic success." (p. 87)

It may be that it is too soon to observe large changes in the schools as a result of the collaborative effort. As children served in the preschool program bring a different orientation to learning, the Center's approach may eventually influence curriculum and instruction in the schools. The current isolation from the schools, however, makes it clear that a transformation has not yet occurred in the school system. The Project has not changed the mission, educational goals, operations, or roles of most school personnel. It would be inaccurate to claim that there is no interaction between the schools and the Center, but it is more of a linkage than an integration, with the Superintendent being almost the sole agent of this linkage. The initiation and current implementation of this project appears, from the perspective of school personnel, to be more "top down" than "bottom up."

Melaville and Blank (1991) advocate involvement of those who actually deliver services at the earliest possible moment to ensure that the partnership exists in more than name only. It should not be assumed by administrators that personnel will automatically implement a new program: Unless participants are "... fully involved in the partnership process, they have no real role to play [and] quickly lose interest." (p. 25-27) Gardner (1990) echoes this finding, "If the planning process is 'top to bottom' with no involvement by parents, teachers, and the youth themselves, then the community will not 'buy in' -- and the proposed plan won't reflect the community's true needs." (p. 11) The above conclusion suggests that a true transformation cannot occur simply with a change in the operations of organizations; it must also occur in the minds of participants.

Involving parents may be crucial to improving their perceptions of the success of interagency collaboration. McLaughlin and Shields (1985) observe that low income parents are not willing to serve on "paper councils," nor will they spend time in non-substantive roles. But schools can reach out and change relationships with low-income parents and communities in ways that improve students' academic and social success (Brooks & Sussman, 1990). Parents became involved in the Center Project, even holding a visible position on the board. They subsequently reported the personnel to be concerned, friendly, and accepting of them and their children. Overall, parents felt that the Center was meeting community needs.

The findings suggest that those who embark on collaborative activities are likely to be expressed in personal terms: trust, one's ability to do the job better,

personal feelings, and personal accommodation to change. Improved services to clients are less likely to be justified as an end in themselves than as a community imperative. The significance of the way people, not organizations, view themselves in a collaborative project is central to the interpretation drawn from these studies, and may offer a promising direction for future research on distinctions between interagency cooperation and collaboration.

We offer several additional recommendations regarding staff development and additional resources to facilitate successful collaboration.

Helping People Adapt to Change

Staff development is essential during the initiation of change from autonomous to interdependent organizations. If changes required by interagency activities are experienced in personal terms, then an emphasis should be placed on the personal satisfactions and feelings of people involved in collaboratives.

Preparation for change can be facilitated by staff orientation sessions designed to acknowledge individuals' feelings and self-perceptions. These sessions need to provide opportunities for personnel to express personal doubts and to explain the basis of the personal satisfactions they can achieve through collaboration. Sessions should be led by professionals who can relate their personal experiences in interagency work and assist staff to anticipate the personally enabling outcomes of such work.

Staff development should foster and support personal growth in self-confidence. It should stress the importance of mutual respect in cooperative decision making and the value of team efforts in an individual's ability to perform the job more effectively. Procedures that de-emphasize formal roles, while continually acknowledging, assisting and emphasizing the personal development and contribution of individuals to joint endeavors, will facilitate collaboration.

Addressing Resource Concerns

Despite the perceived lack of impact of interagency activities on the schools noted in one of the studies, there was acceptance of the need for schools to change to become active partners with social service agencies. However, teachers made it clear that a transformation would be difficult without increasing

financial and human resources. If the schools are to become active participants, it is the teachers who will have to bear the burden of change and be the ones who actually implement the transformation in classrooms. Addressing resource concerns may ease transformation in organizations involved in interagency collaboration, particularly those which are to be centered in schools. Many questions need to be answered in regard to the control of resources; for example, Kirst and McLaughlin (1990) ask about which organization receives funds which follow the child if services are shared.

The acquisition and control of resources breed conflict and power struggles within and among organizations (Wildavsky, 1964). Because policies and regulations of current fragmented organizations are designed to protect autonomy, they often impede efforts to remove boundaries. Policies at the federal, state and local levels that define and fund institutions, eligibility and target population requirements that isolate recipients, guidelines for budgets and program reports, supervision and evaluation methods, and structures that delineate salary and career development all frustrate collaboration. Melaville and Blank (1990) observe: "The natural tendency of participants to maintain their distinctive organizational characteristics gives rise to 'turf issues,' which, in greater or lesser degree, many joint efforts experience." (p. 29) These resource concerns must be addressed as collaboratives are formed.

In summary, there is a need for greater interagency collaboration throughout the nation, and the potential exists for schools to assume an important role in initiating the transformation in community agencies. By involving affected people in all stages of planning and implementation, recognizing that impacts are realized in personal terms, and addressing resource questions, the challenges of initiating and institutionalizing collaboratives might be eased -- and collaborating organizations will more effectively meet children's and families' needs.

References

Appley, D. E. & Winder, A. E. (1977). An evolving definition of collaboration and some implications for the world of work. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, *13* (3), 279-90.

Ascher, C. (1990). Linking schools with human service agencies. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund (ERIC ED 319 877).

Boyd, B. (1991). The impact of interagency relationships on the educational institution: The Leadville Center Project. Paper presented at Conference of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

Brooks, M. G. & Sussman, R. A. (1990). Involving parents in the schools: How can third-party interventions make a difference? Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education (ERIC ED 330 465).

Colorado Department of Education. (1990). Reaching for the future: K-12 public education in Colorado. Denver: Author.

Duning, B., Hetzel, R., & Patrick, S. (1991). 'The Center Project': Transformational collaboration or managerial cooperation? Paper presented at Conference of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

Gardner, S. (1990, Winter). Failure by fragmentation. Equity and Choice, *VI* (2), 4-12.

Goetz, J. P. & Lecompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Gomez, R. (1991). The impact of interagency relationships on the educational institution: Views of parents. Paper presented at Conference of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

Guthrie, Grace P. & Guthrie, Larry F. (1991, September). Streamlining interagency collaboration for youth at risk. Educational Leadership, 17-22.

Hall, G. E. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Handel, R. D. (1990). Shared vision, double vision and changing perspectives: A college/school parent participation program. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC ED 319 833)

Hawley, W. D. (1988, November). Missing pieces of the educational reform agenda: Or why the first and second waves may miss the boat. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24 (4), 416-437.

Heleen, O. (1990, Winter). Community schools and service integration in New York. Equity and Choice, 6 (2), 19-20.

Hodgkinson, H. (1989). All one system: Demographics of education and service delivery systems. Washington, CD: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hodgkinson, H. (1990). Education reform versus reality. In American Association of School Administrators. Beyond the schools. Alexandria, VA: AASA.

Hord, Shirley M. (1986, February). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43 (5), 22-26.

Hoyt, K. (1991, February). Education reform and relationships between the private sector and education: A call for integration. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 450-453.

Kirst, M. W., & McLaughlin, M. (1990). Rethinking policy for children: Implications for educational administration. In Mitchell, B., & Cunningham, L. L. (Eds.). Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools. 89th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. (pp. 69-90). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Liontos, L. B. (1990). Collaboration between schools and social services. Eugene, OR. (ERIC ED 320 197)

McCabe, J. R. (1989). 'The Center' project: A one year history, 1988-1989. Leadville, CO: Lake County School District R-1.

McLaughlin, M. W. & Shields, P. M. (1987, October). Involving low income parents in the schools: A role for policy? Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 156-161.

Melaville, A. I., & Blank, M. J. (1991). What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

National School Boards Association (NSBA). (1991). Link-up: A resource directory. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Schopler, J. H. (1987). Interorganizational groups: Origins, structure, and outcomes. Academy of Management Review, 12 (4), 702-713.

Whitaker, K. S. & King, R. A. (1991). Interagency collaboration: Organizational and political considerations. Paper presented at Conference of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

Wildavsky, A. (1964). The politics of the budgetary process. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1964.

Wolcott, H. F. (1988). Ethnographic research in education. In R. M. Jaeger, Complementary methods for research in education (187-249), Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.